



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,863	09/19/2001	Marian Valerie Underwood	GE-07053	9918

28581 7590 05/26/2004

DUANE MORRIS LLP
100 COLLEGE ROAD WEST, SUITE 100
PRINCETON, NJ 08540-6604

EXAMINER

TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

6

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/955,863	Applicant(s) <UNKNOWN>
Examiner Kuo-Liang J Tang	Art Unit 2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on 3/18/2004.

The priority date for this application is 3/18/2001.

Claims 1-2 remain pending in this application.

Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Charisius et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0104071A1 (hereinafter Charisius).

Claim 2 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charisius et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0104071A1 (hereinafter Charisius) in view of Skufca et al. US Pub. No. 2003/0065827A1 (hereinafter Skufca).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Charisius et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0104071A1 (hereinafter Charisius).

As Per Claim 1, Charisius discloses a method and system software development tool 610 compiles, deploys, and debugs the distributed computing component with a client software component 2004. (See Abstract & FIG 20 and associated text). In that Charisius discloses the method that covering the steps of:

“providing a COTS application server capable of receiving data in a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 item 2006 “EJB Application Server”).

“generating data representing target information, and communicating said data to said COTS application server in the form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 Client Application 2004, EJB container 2018, EJB 2002; Page 13 Section 0156 to Page 14 Section 0158). From Fig 20, the EJB Application Server 2006 is a target application server which provides service to its targets. Also Client Application 2004 is a client which also can be treated as a target (from the target application server’s point of view) that talks / communicates with its server (target application server) in a form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol.

“providing a plurality of computer processing arrangements, each of which is capable of processing Java;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 item 2004, item 2006; FIG 21; Page 3 Section 0036 and Page 13 Section 0155).

“in said application server, processing said J2EE compliant data with a plurality of Enterprise Java Beans software components, establishing those of said computer processing arrangements in which said data is processed;” (E.g., see FIG. 21 and Page 3 Section 0036, Page 13 Section 0155).

“providing said J2EE compliant data to the selected ones of said computer processing arrangements, for thereby generating processed data; (E.g., see FIG. 21 and Page 3 Section 0036, Page 14 Section 0163). and

“providing said processed data to a user.” (E.g., see FIG. 20 EJB Object Stub (browser) 2012).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charisius et al. US Pub. No. 2002/0104071A1 (hereinafter Charisius) in view of Skufca et al. US Pub. No. 2003/0065827A1 (hereinafter Skufca).

As Per Claim 2, Charisius discloses the method that covering the steps of:

“providing a COTS application server capable of receiving data in a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 item 2006 “EJB Application Server”).

“generating data representing target information, and communicating said data to said COTS application server in the form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 Client Application 2004, EJB container 2018, EJB 2002; Page 13 Section 0156 to Page 14 Section 0158).

“providing a plurality of computer processing arrangements, each of which is capable of processing Java;” (E.g., see FIG. 20 item 2004, item 2006; FIG 21; Page 3 Section 0036 and Page 13 Section 0155).

Art Unit: 2122

“in said application server, processing said J2EE compliant data with a plurality of Enterprise Java Beans software components, establishing those of said computer processing arrangements in which said data is processed;” (E.g., see FIG. 21 and Page 3 Section 0036, Page 13 Section 0155).

“providing said J2EE compliant data to the selected ones of said computer processing arrangements, for thereby generating processed data; (E.g., see FIG. 21 and Page 3 Section 0036, Page 14 Section 0163). and

“providing said processed data to a user.” (E.g., see FIG. 20 EJB Object Stub (browser) 2012).

Charisius doesn't explicitly disclose his J2EE compliant data with “a Corba software component arrangement”. However, Skufca provides a mean for wrapping to multiple data source fields that include CORBA component, “a Corba software component arrangement” (E.g., Page 4 Section 0036). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the teaching of Skufca with the method of Charisius, to use a Corba software component arrangement. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that it would enhance the Charisius teachings and/or system with a more versatile tool for covering all of the component based.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 03/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks section, the applicant argues that:

The Charisius et al. reference makes no mention whatever of a "target" but instead refers to a "target application server". (E.g. see page 6, line 29 to page 7 line 7)

Examiner's response:

Examiner disagrees with applicant's assertion that Charisius et al. reference doesn't mention whatever of a "target".

From Fig 20, the EJB Application Server 2006 is a target application server which provides service to its targets. Also Client Application 2004 is a client which also can be treated as a target (from the target application server's point of view) that talks / communicates with its server (target application server) in a form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2122

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306.

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner



**TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**